REMARKS

The present amendment and remarks are in response to the Final Office Action entered in the above identified case and mailed on June 10, 2009. Claims 1-34, 36 and 38-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35. U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,571 to Spriggs et al. (Hereafter, Spriggs). Claims 15 and 16 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base, but the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 19-34, 36 and 3842 have been allowed.

With this response Applicants have amended independent claim 1 and canceled claim 2. With these changes Applicants respectfully submit that all of the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance.

In order for a claim to be anticipated under 35. U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element of the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. In the present case, amended claim 1 is not anticipated because Spriggs does not teach a configuration engine that fills the binding memory of an executable graphic display with a reference to a physical or logical process entity corresponding to an indication of a physical or logical entity with which the graphical element has been associated, as now called for in amended claim 1. In fact, Spriggs does not teach graphic display having a binding memory at all.

Amended claim 1 now includes many of the features previously called for in dependent claim 2 In the Final Office Action regarding claim 2 the Examiner stated that Spriggs discloses a configuration engine ("configuration module 202") that determines a reference ("configuration module 202") to be stored in the binding memory ("utilities module 200") based on the identity of the one of the physical and logical process entities ("transducers/sensors 70") to which the graphic display ("display module 100") is associated. It is not clear from Examiner's comments exactly how Spriggs anticipates a configuration engine that fills a binding memory with a reference to a physical or logical process entity corresponding to an indication of a physical of logical entity with which the indication is associated. According to the Examiner's comments, the configuration module 202 disclosed by Spriggs corresponds to both the configuration engine and the reference to be stored in a

binding memory as called for in claim 2 of the present application. On its face this statement makes no sense at all. Apparently the Examiner is saying that Spriggs teaches that the configuration module 202 determines a reference (itself) and stores itself on a utilities module 200. The absurdity of such a statement needs no elaboration.

The elements at issue with amended claim 1 are fairly specific. An executable display includes, among other things, two memories: a parameter memory; and a binding memory. The binding memory is adapted to store a reference for communicatively connecting the parameter memory to a data source within a process plant. A configuration engine enables a user to configure the operation of the graphic display by associating the graphic display within the configuration database with one of the indications of the physical process entities within the configuration database. Upon the user making such an association, the configuration engine fills the binding memory with a reference to the physical or logical process entity corresponding to the one of the indications of the physical and logical process entities with which the graphic display is associated.

Despite the Examiner's assertions, Spriggs does not teach a graphic display having a parameter memory and a binding memory associated therewith. At one point (Page 4 of the Final Office Action) the Examiner states that the configuration module 202 disclosed by Spriggs reads on the functionality of the binding memory of the present application. At another point (Page 6 of the Final Office Action) the Examiner states that the utilities module 200 disclosed by Spriggs reads on the binding memory, and that the utilities module 200 stores a reference in the form of configuration module 202. Neither scenario is a plausible reading of Spriggs. If anything the configuration module 202 taught by Spriggs corresponds with the "configuration engine" claimed in the present application (however, as will be described below, even this comparison is inapt given that Spriggs' configuration module does not perform all of the functions of the configuration engine called for in the claims of the present application). Neither utilities module 200 nor the configuration module 202 disclosed by Spriggs is described as forming a binding memory adapted to receive and store a reference for communicatively connecting a parameter memory to a data source within a process plant. Furthermore, nothing in the Spriggs disclosure would indicate that the configuration module 202 is a reference that may be stored in the binding memory for communicatively connecting a parameter memory to a physical or logical process entity in a process plant. If the

Examiner disagrees with this assessment Applicant's respectfully request that she specifically point out by column and line number where Spriggs describes the configuration module as comprising a memory associated with a graphic display that is adapted to receive a reference for communicatively connecting a parameter memory to a data source within a process plant.

Further, Spriggs does not teach a configuration engine that, in additional to allowing a user to configure the operation of a graphic display by associating the graphic display with an indication of a physical or logical process entity, where, upon the user making such an association, the configuration engine fills a binding memory associated with the graphic display with a reference to the physical or logical entity to which the graphic display has been associated. Again, if the Examiner disagrees with this reading of Spriggs, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point specifically by column and line number to the portions of Spriggs teaching these features and explain exactly how they relate to the present claims.

In the above arguments Applicants have specifically pointed out differences between the claimed invention and the prior art in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b). In contrast, it is the Examiner in the Final Office Action who has made only general allegations as to how various components disclosed by Spriggs teach the claimed features of the present invention, without describing how such components perform the various functions called for in the claims. If the Examiner maintains the present rejections Applicant request that she explain exactly how these components perform the functions called for in the claims.

Because Spriggs does not teach each and every feature of the claimed inventory the claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b). Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and ask that the Examiner move the case to issue.

Dated: September 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Jeffrey H. Canfield #38,404/

Jeffrey H. Canfield
Registration No.: 38,404
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant